UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Present Significance of the Past - - - - - - - - *Francis Neilson*

The Church and World Peace - - - - - - - - - *Philip S. Bernstein*

The Drive to Get America into War - - - - - - - - *John Haynes Holmes*

Christian Direct Action - *Fred W. Shorter*

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 4

Chicago, October 16, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 51
Jottings—J. H. H. 54
The Drive to Get America into War—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ... 54

ARTICLES—
The Present Significance of the Past—FRANCIS NEILSON 56
On the Pacifist Front—J. H. H. 60
The Church and World Peace—PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN 61
Christian Direct Action—FRED W. SHORTER 62

POETRY—
He Who Laughs Last—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 60
Kinship—LLOYD FRANK MERRELL 63

THE STUDY TABLE—
Worshipful Public Service—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 63

CORRESPONDENCE—
Propaganda of Omission—EDITH WYNNER 64
Can We Be Christians?—JOHN A. ROWLAND 64
Questions Democracy of Empires—VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW. 64
Does Not Like the Church!—GEORGE W. TUCKER 64

THE FIELD—
American Rediscovery Week 50

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

American Rediscovery Week

The following is an announcement published by the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, Professor Franz Boaz, Chairman:

PROCLAMATION OF AMERICAN REDISCOVERY WEEK

October 8th to 14th, 1939

WHEREAS the United States of America was founded for the solemn purpose of assuring to all men their equal and unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;

WHEREAS the Constitution of these United States was established to promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty to its inhabitants;

WHEREAS the American people fought and suffered long and bloody wars to secure the equal protection of the laws to all persons, so that now these rights form the very bone and sinew of their national life and history;

WHEREAS these rights are once again being challenged by powerful foes of equality and liberty, both at home and abroad:

Through attempts to deny man's right to express his opinions freely and to share in the choice of his government,

Through the dissemination of false racial theories which deny the equality of man's birthright and set man against man according to the color of his skin or the name of his grandfather,

Through attempts to deny to the foreign born and aliens the equal protection of the laws which the Constitution guarantees them, and further

Through attempts to single out these groups for harsh and inequitable treatment as a stepping stone to the destruction of the traditional immunities of all persons; and

WHEREAS these attacks on the common rights of the people subvert all that has been most treasured in the history of America—indeed, do so in the very name of American patriotism,

BE IT THEREFORE PROCLAIMED that the anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus and the week in which it falls be established as a Week for the Rediscovery of America and of those rights which from the beginning of its history have made its name the symbol of liberty.

Let this Week be the occasion for celebrating and reaffirming the principles of American Democracy, in a solemn resolve to secure for all the inhabitants of these United States the necessary conditions for life itself: liberty and equal rights for all, regardless of color, creed, political conviction, or national origin.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1939 No. 4

MORNING PAPER

How easily the trouble of a day
May find its anodyne.
How swiftly, with what certain reassurance
The morning be reclaimed from its confusion,
Its weird bewilderment.

The news! How thickly wrought of curse and carnage,
Of stupid, servile, impotent conclusion,
Of sad, blind bartering.

We turn and turn and seek, and mostly find
Record of rancor and its false, dour harvest,
With here and there some timid white opinion.

Then suddenly—
In a scant dimension, in a narrow corner,
A sign of beauty, fearless and austere.
A brief, small world of beatific words
That thrust the heart with rapture like a spear
Of resurrecting light.
And terror and all dread are straightway gone.
The morning is a star
Upon the dark tumultuous firmament.
And for this cause, this poem true and clear,
We shall not fear the day,
Nor the tomorrow with its wake of days.

BARBARA YOUNG, in the *New York Times*

SAVE THE NEUTRALITY LAW

This move to change the Neutrality Law, to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions, can be beaten. The people are aroused. With a sure democratic instinct they know that the way to stay out of war is to *stay out*. They also know that behind this proposal to make America an arsenal for the Allies there lie more sinister purposes than appear upon the surface. It is no accident that, for the first time in Roosevelt's administration, the business interests are unanimously with him, and the great newspapers, which have been fighting him for years, are now holding up his hands. The people understand—and they are going to defeat this change in the law. For weeks Washington has been buried under such a flood of protesting mail as the capital has not seen in a generation. The senatorial majority for the lifting of the embargo, described as large in the beginning, has now been reduced to the vanishing point. Twenty-four or more senators, led by such stalwart peace veterans as Senator Borah, Senator Nye, Senator La Follette, and Senator Johnson, are linked in a solid phalanx to fight the measure to the death. Don't forget that on this fight depends the whole question as to whether or not America is going to plunge into the war! Don't forget that the President and a well-nigh unanimous Congress enacted the Neutrality Law two years ago with the express purpose of keeping the country out of war. For what imaginable reason can its revision now be proposed except to join us with Britain and France in European hostilities? The President has again, as so many times before, changed his mind. But the people have *not* changed theirs! This embargo measure can be defeated. With this job done, let us turn to the Ludlow Amendment and force Congress to enact this measure without further delay. This is the hour of danger. Now is the time to act. Upon the coming Congressional vote hang the destinies of this republic and the lives of many thousands of its citizens. Write your Representatives! Telegraph your Senators! Neutrality must and will be saved.

PACIFISM STILL HOLDS

It is heartening to see how the pacifist forces of this country are standing firm in this hour of crisis. We detect no wavering in the ranks, no questionings, no doubts, no fears. Of course, there are those who have never thought the pacifist philosophy through, and thus have fooled themselves and other people into thinking that they were pacifists, and have now gone over to the warmongers with an enthusiasm which outmatches that of the militarists. Peacetime pacifists are as numerous, and as disreputable, as fair-weather Christians! But the true pacifist, whose convictions are a religion—he has not, and, will not change. For one thing, this war is no surprise to him. He may not have expected, as we ourselves did not expect, that the war would come so soon, or be fought over such an empty issue as Danzig. But that the conflict was sooner or later inevitable, in a post-Versailles Europe arming itself to the teeth, has been apparent to the pacifist for years. For we know as scientifically today the causes that lead to war as the meteorologist knows the causes that lead to a hurricane. All these causes have been present and operating in Europe—therefore, what could we expect? Also, as another explanation of the unfaltering attitude of the pacifist, there is the fact that the pacifist's thought is determined by principle and not by expediency. He is moved by the laws of eternal truth and not by the events of the passing hour. War, to the pacifist, is inconsistent with all morality and all religion, to say nothing of all reason.

It cannot be fitted into any ethical code, or into any spiritual faith. It is in its very nature a denial of everything that is true and righteous altogether. It makes no difference, therefore, what are the circumstances of a war—who is fighting it, why it has broken out, what issues are said to be involved. War is *war*—that's all that concerns the pacifist. And war, just because it is *war,* is wrong, unholy, insane, can never settle any issue, never do any good, never win any security or attain any peace. The pacifist takes his stand, whatever winds may blow. He is doing this today, and therewith giving us the only hope this wretched world still holds.

THE CHURCH AND WAR

The church has got to make up its mind to make up its mind about this war business. There was a time, perhaps, when the church could sit on the fence, with whatever loss of dignity and moral integrity, and bless war with one hand and reject it with the other. But the totalitarian states, and increasingly all governments, are seeing to it today that the church line up and obey the drill sergeant, or else . . . ! This brings clearly to the fore the issue of Christ or Caesar, God or the State—which seems to recall to our mind some ancient saying to the effect that "no man can serve two masters"! The Oxford Conference faced this dilemma without deciding it. "When it came to the question of the Christian citizen's choice between his loyalty to the pure ideal of Christ and his loyalty to the state in a war crisis," runs the report of the Conference, "the section dealing with this matter was unable to reach a conviction." To understand the meaning of this passage, how about paraphrasing it to read, "When it came to the question of serving God or Mammon, Jesus and his disciples were unable to reach a conviction"? But, to the credit of the Oxford Conference be it said that the Conference itself recognized the instability, not to say the unworthiness, of its own confession. *"The church,"* went on the report, *"cannot acquiesce permanently in these differences."* It cannot indeed! Now is the hour to decide as to whether the church is to palliate war, excuse war, apologize for war, support war—war with its bloodshed, its horror, its destruction, its bestial immorality, its satanic lust!—or denounce war and repudiate it and oppose it for the sin it really is. For ourself, we can see no imaginable reason for hesitation—except that of cowardice, which Jesus knew nothing about when he went to the cross! The issue is plain—is the church serving the kingdom of this world, or is it serving the Kingdom of God? The plea of our country we hear and feel—but it is a plea of this world. It cannot therefore be heeded by the church when the drums beat and the trumpets sound for slaughter, for the church is serving God and his Kingdom evermore.

WAR PROFITS AGAIN

The merry business of making profits out of the war is going right straight on. Brokers' advertisements, investment letters, financial articles are everywhere. None has impressed us more than a letter from the house of Babson, Wellesley Hills, telling us how to make money. Here are some quotations:

> Will the pattern of 1914-18 be re-enacted? Bethlehem Steel rose to $700 per share.
>
> What about our Neutrality Law? . . . Will business boom?
>
> There are certain industries which will benefit—horrible as that may sound—from this war. Others will be seriously handicapped!
>
> To help you get the maximum protection [?] under today's uncertainties and profit from tomorrow's developments, we are preparing an Investor's Envelope containing a comprehensive set of reports on today's vital investment problems. . . . Special features:
>
> (1) *Future Leaders:* Six selected War Stocks still in buying range.
>
> (2) *Aggressive Switches for Profit:* Certain exchanges are advised for better appreciation during this critical period. . . .
>
> Here's your chance to test Babson's advice. . . . To get your personal confidential copy, just sign and return the enclosed form order. The cost is only $3.00.

We are publishing this information without charge to Mr. Babson, and therefore we are free to make some comments. One is that this is a perfect specimen of the war-profits game, and thus proof, if any were needed, that this war, like the last war, is a profit-makers' paradise. Which raises the important question—how much have the profit-makers had to do with making this war? Another comment is the obvious one that the Babson Company is proposing to make its own profit out of the war while helping other persons to make theirs. Which reminds us that the great Babson was lately Moderator of the Congregational Churches of this country, and has always been a very religious man!

THE RUSSIAN NAPOLEON

If there was ever any doubt as to the real character of the Russian pact with Germany, that doubt has been tragically and terribly removed by recent developments of Russian policy. The original non-aggression pact was full of mystery. In itself, like Russia's non-aggression pact with Italy, it might have been regarded as an innocent thing, even as a move to be welcomed by those who fear war and hate imperialism in every form. But the timing of this Nazi-Communist pact, the double-crossing of its signing, the very absurdity of Nazis and Reds clasping hands on any agreement of any kind, combined to stir immediate suspicion, and moved UNITY to an instant expression of dismay and denunciation. Now, alas, all mystery has been cleared away, and we see this so-called non-aggression pact between the Wilhelmstrasse and the Kremlin for what it really is—an out-and-out military alliance for the partitioning of Poland and the dividing up of eastern Europe. The Soviet invasion of Poland, at the moment when Polish armies were collapsing beneath the blows of the Nazi machine, was a thing so horrible as to defy description. This was followed by the Rus-

sian invasion of Roumania and the Russian blockade of Esthonia. Behold the spectacle of German and Russian officials meeting at the new Brest-Litovsk, with mutual salutes and heils, to share the spoils of conquest! Only one thing can make this situation worse—and this is already on the way. We refer to a Russian agreement with Japan, matched to the model of the Russian agreement with Germany, for the dividing up of China, and of Asia. This was begun with the declaration of a truce between the two powers on the Mongolian frontier, which will be followed, perhaps before this editorial is published, by a pact which will be in effect a military alliance. Then will Russia be sitting pretty—bestriding the world like a colossus! Stalin is the perfect traitor. He has betrayed the memory of Lenin, the trust of the Russian people, the tradition of the revolution, and the hopes of progressive and liberal spirits throughout the world. Russia has now completed the historic cycle of revolutionary France—come at last to its Napoleon, the supreme dictator and ruthless military conqueror. We now see how fitting it is that Stalin should have been living all these years in the Kremlin—the successor, indeed, of the Russian Tsars!

VETERANS

There was much talk in the newspapers, in the early days of the war, of an old man at Doorn, Holland. He was pictured as sitting at the radio, blanch-faced and trembling, listening to the oncoming doom of Europe. It was said that, when England struck on September 3rd, he knelt at the bedside of his wife and prayed. He was described, and is now described, as poring over a map, and placing pins to mark the advance and retreat of armies. It is not surprising that the world thinks of this old man, and seeks report of his doings. For this is the ex-Kaiser of Germany, Wilhelm II, who in the last war sat in the seat not of exile but of power. How his mind must race back to 1914, and wonder, if he had it to do all over again - - - ! Another old man, of whom we do not seem to hear so much these days, is Lloyd George, England's war leader in 1917-18, and England's peacemaker at Versailles. Is it from feelings of pity or shame that this ancient figure is so nearly neglected? He sat in his seat in the House of Commons when war was declared. He even made a little speech! But nobody listened or cared. What is this old man thinking about these days? When he sits alone and forsaken by his hearth-fire and hears the guns and bombs of this second World War, does he ponder the peace he might have made when he held the reins of power? Two other veterans of the last war prominent in this war are Winston Churchill, of England, and Marshal Petain, of France. The former sits in the admiralty in London, the latter in the war office in Paris. What do *they* think about? Of the futility of force which they have advocated all their days—of the madness of war in which they have won distinction and taken delight? Or do they weigh, perhaps, the question as to what they will get out of this war, in terms of liberty and peace, which they could not, or at least did not get out of the last war? Of the great figures of 1914-1918, these alone are left—unless we include Herbert Hoover, who caught the imagination of humanity by his relief activities. All the others are gone—and are thereby fortunate. They have not lived to see this day. Yet, upon some farther shore, may they still gaze upon this world, and weep for their own failures, and for the sins and woes of men.

THE RADIO RIDDLE

Never has the radio seemed so wonderful and so indispensable as during this war—and never also has it seemed so intolerable! It did a marvellous job in the hectic days preceding the outbreak of conflict. If it is not doing so good a job now, it is because there is little news available except at climactic moments, and the announcers and commentators have nothing to do but to fill in. But all the while there is continuing on the air the silly trivialities of radio entertainment, which in contrast with a crashing world are now seen in their true character of complete inanity. Is it possible that there are people who listen to this stuff—the jazz, the swing, the horrible crooning, the intolerable chatter, the advertising presented with a strenuosity which makes no distinction between a tube of tooth paste or a constipation pill and a vast disaster of arms in Europe? If so, then is the standard of intelligence in this country at a level far below the moronic—and the hope for democracy more desperate than we had ever imagined. For what are they doing in Nazi Germany at this very hour? Broadcasting war news, of course, and propaganda speeches to keep up the morale! But in between, on the long stretches when news is scarce and speeches not available, the German radios are broadcasting Bach and Beethoven and Wagner, with military music played by the best bands of the nation. We could dispense with the military music all right, especially the transcribed blarings of trombone and bugle, which are already beginning to find their way into our stations. But the jazz orchestras, with their tootings and squealings—the Merriment Boys and the Frolicking Girls, with their ghastly singing and joking (so-called)—and the announcers, with their impenetrable good cheer and incredible attempts at humor—well, they make us sick, and tempt us to revilements not conducive to spiritual health. As long as we live, we shall remember that moment when there came over the radio the happy tones of an announcer saying, "This European war is certainly a headache, folks, but your own headache is more personal and important, so try So-and-So's headache tablets, etc., etc." Ye gods, if we had had an axe!!!

Jottings

It is with a heavy heart that we resume our jottings for another year. Humor seems out of place these days, and irony cruel. Yet, with whatever effort, must we maintain the integrity of our thought; and a sharp word, like a surgeon's knife, may serve still to cut an ulcer. So we shall try to be true, though not unkind.

A friend writes us of hearing an evangelist, at a revival service at Asbury Park, New Jersey, speak of "the people of the war-torn countries—*among them* God's children, our brothers in Christ." So! *all* these stricken people are not God's children! Even in this hour, there must be distinction between Christians and non-Christians, as between friends and enemies! What wonder that Christianity has not saved the world!

"John L. Lewis is the Samson of American labor; and the Communist Party is his current Delilah."—Benjamin Stolberg, in the *Saturday Evening Post.*

This may be so! But, according to the latest pictures we have seen, Delilah has not yet shorn those gorgeous locks.

English newspaper cartoonists are picturing Hitler as a gorilla, Goering as a pig, and Goebbels as a snake. This is a relief to pent-up feelings, we have no doubt, but it wins no war and helps no peace.

The *Railway Age* reports that "the saving effected by eliminating a stop of an 11-car passenger train is 50 cents, and of an 80-car freight train is $1.45. Inspired by the man who found that most victims of railroad accidents were passengers in the last car, and suggested as a remedy that the last car be taken off, we suggest herewith a remedy for the prevailing bankruptcy of our railroads. Let them save money by eliminating all stops!

In these desperate days, it is interesting to read the opinion of Adolf Hitler as to how it is all coming out. See *Mein Kampf,* Reynal and Hitchcock edition, page 959:

" . . . the conclusion of a treaty with Russia embodies the declaration of the next war. Its outcome would be the end of Germany."

J. H. H.

The Drive to Get America into War*

Nothing is so vitally important to the American people at this present moment as to keep our own country out of the war now raging on the continent of Europe. This is especially important in view of the efforts being made on every side to get this country into the conflict. One would think that the proposition was so ridiculous that it could find no salesmen foolish enough to try to put it over. We went into the last war under the impression that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy and to end war forever on this planet. We sacrificed 137,000 of our fairest young men, dead or maimed; we expended $40,000,000,000 of our hard-earned wealth; we corrupted our public morals, disordered our political and economic life, prepared the way for the great depression; only to discover that Europe was not interested in ideals, that France and England were concerned not with peace but with extending and consolidating their empires, that in the Versailles Treaty were the inevitable causes and conditions of another war. And now this war has come! Is it conceivable that the American people are such idiots as to be drawn into war again? Are we actually going to burn our fingers a second time pulling the hot chestnuts of other nations out of the imperialistic fire? It would seem to be impossible. The worst cynics could not charge a democracy with conduct which a moronic child would know enough to avoid. Yet siren voices are again enticing us into the whirlpools of deceit and disaster. In a few months, even a few weeks, we shall be in dire danger of being swept off our feet by a campaign to get us into this new war even as we went into the old one. This campaign is being organized on at least three fronts.

First, there is the English propaganda, which is already well under way. Indeed, this propaganda got started long before hostilities began, for the visit to this country last June of King George and Queen Elizabeth, a delightful social event in which guests and hosts alike were at their best, was in essence nothing in the world but a magnificently camouflaged attempt to persuade every American to do his duty when Great Britain was again fighting for her empire. Now this English propaganda is descending upon us like an avalanche. We know just how it was prepared and loosed a quarter of a century ago. Every detail of the long-sustained, highly organized, enormously expensive, and completely successful undertaking upon the part of the English to drag us into the last war has long since been published, and is familiar. Even the plans for getting us into this next war have been carelessly or callously laid bare in Mr. Sidney Rogerson's amazing book, entitled *Propaganda in the Next War,* published in England a year ago, but not yet pub-

*This Editorial was originally spoken as a radio address in New York.

lished in this country. Every move for our seduction, in other words, has been prepared, and now, with the opportune arrival of a new British ambassador, Lord Lothian, well trained by his experience in the last war, may be expected to be started without delay. Newspapers, radios, movies, and lecture platforms will combine to release these propaganda germs upon us. We shall encounter them at our public dinners, in our churches, in our drawing-rooms, in our homes. It will be like breathing the foul atmosphere of pestilence. Have we become immune to this contagion? Have we built up resistance to such attack? Or are we the same old "easy marks" we were in 1914-17? This coming year will give to us the answer.

Secondly, there are the business interests which are eager to get us into the war for the sake of the profits that may be made. "Thar's gold in them thar hills" was the cry of the pioneer prospectors who wandered the ranges of the far West in the covered-wagon days. "There's gold in that there fighting" is the cry of American industrialists, exporters, and jobbers generally who supply the myriad materials with which a modern war is kept going. Chief among these, of course, are the armament and munition manufacturers, whose methods are no longer mysterious. These "merchants of death," as they have been called, have for years been fomenting wars, continuing wars, extending wars, for the sake of keeping business at top speed in the munition plants. Again and again they have started war scares, organized preparedness campaigns, defeated disarmament and peace conferences, and always in wartime have sold their goods indiscriminately to both sides, the enemy as well as their own country. Just now they are dedicating their talents to breaking down the Neutrality Law, by removing the present embargo against selling and shipping arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations. For this is the real explanation of what is going on in Washington today. It is not the will of the President nor the wish of the people that is important, but the nefarious purposes of these munition manufacturers, to whom the present Neutrality Law is an obstacle in the way of big profits. The Capitol is swarming with the lobbyists of the Big Business interests. The President is surrounded no longer by the liberal and progressive counsellors who have fashioned the New Deal, but, strangely enough, by the very crowd of bankers and corporation magnates whom he has for so long been fighting. The Neutrality Law was passed two years ago, and signed by the President, for the express purpose of keeping this country out of another European war. Now it is being attacked, for the express purpose of getting us into this war, by those who know exactly what they want.

This is not to deny that there are good citizens who seek the repeal of this embargo law for reasons purely unselfish and idealistic. They believe that we should not deny arms and munitions to France and England in their struggle against Hitler's Germany, which they regard as involving everything that is precious to our civilization. But do these people know what they are doing? Do they realize that the repeal of the embargo is the first step of an entrance into the European war which will not end until our boys are being shipped across the seas by the millions, to die in strange and lonely lands? If they do realize this, why do they not tell us, and urge now, instead of later, that America become one of the active belligerents against Germany? There is no mystery about this process of entering a war. We went through the whole thing a quarter of a century ago. First, we sell goods to the embattled nations. Then we provide loans and credits, which may easily be accomplished by the repeal of the Johnson Act. Then we discover that the nations not accessible to our aid become angry, then hostile, and at last openly our enemy. Then we are attacked, and ourselves get angry, and talk loudly about honor, and national interests, and the vindication of democracy, and, before we know it, are in the war. "Easy is the descent into Avernus." If we change the Neutrality Law by repealing the embargo, we shall have entered the war, to all intents and purposes, at the moment of repeal. All the support of this proposal, consciously or unconsciously, is a move to get us lined up on the battle-front with Britain and France. We shall decide within the next few weeks, in this single Congressional fight, whether a year or two years hence American blood will soak the soil of Europe.

Lastly, there is the political influence which is today headed straight toward the goal of war. By this I mean specifically our President, whose good qualities curiously combine with his bad to make him a highly dangerous leader in this crisis. In saying this, I do not mean to charge, or even suggest, that Mr. Roosevelt is not a sincere and ardent lover of peace. On more than one occasion, and in more than one way, he has shown that he desires peace as wholeheartedly as any of us. But he interprets peace in terms of arms and of intervention in war. Already he has chosen sides in this European struggle. At this moment, in Washington, he is using every means at his disposal to bring about a situation in which he may give aid to France and England in their battle against Germany. As the struggle becomes severe and long-continued, he will want to do more than help the Allies with arms and munitions. The chances are he will want to intervene actively on their side by lending them money, sending them ships, giving them our navy, and at last giving them our boys. Already, before the war is two months old, Mr. Roosevelt is walking in the footsteps of his great political hero, Woodrow Wilson. Let it be remembered that Wilson was a peace-lover also; that he took us into war less than six months after he had won an election on the slogan, "he kept us out of war"; that he entered this war

sincerely to establish a durable peace and thus to get rid of war forever. It is when I look most intently at Mr. Wilson's example that I fear most dreadfully Mr. Roosevelt's policies. In both cases I see a sincere love of peace, coupled with an indubitable love of power, and an o'erleaping ambition to use power to dictate peace to a warring world. Mr. Wilson tried it, with results all too terribly familiar. If anybody can tell me how Mr. Roosevelt can succeed where Mr. Wilson failed, I should like to hear.

Such are some of the influences now directed to getting America into this war. If these influences succeed, they will achieve the supreme tragedy of history. For America, the last hope of the world, the last refuge of civilization, will then go down in a common ruin with mankind. For ourselves and for mankind alike, we must stay out of this war, that we may be able to do certain indispensable things that we alone can do. First, preserve inviolate within our borders those democratic institutions and principles without which civilization cannot hope to survive. Secondly, bring succor to the millions of distressed and dying who will soon be cumbering the earth. Thirdly, work, as only a neutral and thus mutually friendly nation can work, to stop the fighting at the earliest possible moment. Lastly, seek peace, and see to it, when peace is made, that it is a peace which is merciful and just, and thus calculated to endure. Our fatal mistake in the last war was to sit at the peace table as a belligerent and thus as a friend of the victors. In this war we must plan to sit at the peace table as a neutral, and thus as a friend of humankind.

This is our mission. It will be lost, if it is not defended. And it must be defended *now,* if it is to be achieved. Therefore the slogan of this hour, KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Present Significance of the Past*

FRANCIS NEILSON

Can we, in our busy lives, take the time to consider what we owe to the past? It is a strange question to ask today, for so much of our thought bears upon the present, so much of it is devoted to the future that we have been trained by our modern mentors to look to the days to come, as those which will bring us hours of well-being and leisure. Unfortunately, the predictions of the modern prophets have not been fulfilled so far as material comfort is concerned, and certainly the day of leisure, in the true sense of the term, has been set much farther off in the future. The more we strive industrially, the less we gain; and the more leisure, the less culture. This is not putting these grave matters too strongly; perhaps the reason for the condition which faces the youth of today is to be found in the lack of inclination to acquire a culture which will enable him to read the riddles of life with some composure. . .

When one considers that the scholasticism of the Middle Ages was based upon the Classics, and that the great revival of learning, which spread over England in the days of Wyclif and Erasmus, was based upon the Greek and Roman authors and the Bible, it seems curious that, today, our attention should be concentrated mainly upon the productions of men of our time. This is to be attributed to what has been called the advancement of the "scientific method"; but many men still talk in exactly the same terms that we all used back in the days of Huxley and Tyndall.

These two men were the leading agnostics of two generations ago. They were undoubtedly great scientists and, perhaps, they had more to do with reshaping the ideas of our systems of education than any two men of the period. Both lectured to working class audiences, and devoted much of their time to societies for the encouragement of the pursuit of knowledge. It has been said that Huxley was largely responsible for the decline in Bible reading. He could not dispense with the Bible, and yet he could not accept it. He considered that it was essential in a system of education, but what he called "the myths" disturbed his scientific mind and caused him hours of perplexity. Were he alive today, and just as keen as he was, as a scientist, to learn what is taking place in the world, he would be the most amazed man in England or America. For many of the Bible myths which he could not accept have been reconsidered in the light of scientific knowledge, and now it is admitted that the writers of the work, in recording the story of the past, had considerable substance on which to base what Huxley called "their myths."

Consider first the myth of Abraham: today Ur of the Chaldees is a place, not merely a Bible name. Also, the dates of the stories in the Pentateuch have been substantiated by the archaeologists who have worked in Egypt and Palestine. The dynasties of the kings are fairly well known now. Take another myth which disturbed Huxley and kept him awake at night; that was the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites and the catastrophe that happened to the battalions of Pharaoh. Scientists who have worked upon the territory now inform us that this could have happened because the area reveals all the indications of having, in the past, suffered from severe physical and tidal changes.

Then again, Huxley was quite disturbed by the twenty-first verse of the thirteenth chapter of Exodus, which tells us: "The Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light." Scientists have now found that they were heading for a volcano which was erupting and, of course, there was a column of smoke by day, and a pillar of fire by night. The construction put upon these

*A commencement address delivered last June at Ripon College, most appropriately published at this season when thousands of students are resuming their college work.—*Editor.*

myths by the writers of the Old Testament is not one whit stranger than the constructions which are put upon certain scientific manifestations by the scientists today. They interpret them in their own way.

Not only Huxley but other scientists have lost many nights' sleep over the report in the Old Testament of the conquest of Jericho by Joshua. They concentrated their attention upon a blast of trumpets which caused the walls to fall down and the command of the man at the head of the Israelites for the sun to stand still. These were regarded as unadulterated myths which no sensible man could possibly accept. Since Huxley's day, John Garstang has worked on the site of Jericho and has revealed, after excavating for some time, that the walls did fall down and that the city was burned. Again, scientists show that the land suffered from earthquake, and the coincidence of a blast of trumpets and an earthquake taking place just when Joshua was ready to destroy the city seems, of course, to many skeptics, to be carrying dramatic license a bit too far.

Some time ago, Garstang sent Mrs. Neilson some pots which he unearthed at a level lower than that of the Jericho of the Bible. These pots she gave to the collection at the Oriential Institute of the University of Chicago, and an expert, when examining them, remarked on the symmetry and simplicity of work 2400 years before this era, and he added that there was really nothing finer in this respect produced today.

We think we know a great deal about building, laying one stone on top of another, but our pride is somewhat humbled when we stand before the base of the step-pyramid at the Sakkara. Professor Firth of the British Museum removed the sand which had gathered during several milleniums, and found that the marble casing of the first step was intact, and so remarkable was the work that it was impossible to insert a piece of note-paper in the joints. How many books have been written on Greek architecture which have assured us that the Doric form, particularly that of the column, was original with the Dorian Greeks? Yet, strange to say, Firth, in removing the sand at the base of the step-pyramid, discovered a Doric temple which must date nearly 2,000 years before any known Doric architecture in the Greek archipelago. For nearly a hundred years now the past has been antedating the past, and archaeologists and historians find that much of the work that was given to us for our studies must be rewritten. This is the day when we boast of our engineers and our builders of bridges and dams, but what an extraordinary thing it would be if some of our engineers could tell us how the ancient Egyptians were able to place the marble coffins in the tombs of the Serapeum at the Sakkara! Neither the entrance to the tomb which is cut in solid rock, nor the alleys indicate in any way how these gigantic sarcophagi of the sacred bulls were lodged in the tombs. Our modern engineers are dumbfounded when they see them and speculate upon the task of putting them there.

It is well that we should keep in mind, when we are paying homage to the wonderful achievements of modern science, that there were engineers who did mighty things long before our era was thought of; and that there were philosophers with a comprehension of what life is, and what it means to man, who gave us the fundamentals upon which we work today. Thucydides and Livy were no mean historians, and, strange as it may seem, there are scientists today who still revere Aristotle. Moreover, notwithstanding our Whitehead and Bradley, we have no Plato to deal with ideas and metaphysics; indeed, metaphysics seems to be the bane of the modern thinker's existence.

Therefore, it surely behooves us, when we are considering a system of education, to see that the young who seek knowledge should have every opportunity of entering into as wide a sphere of it as possible, so that the ripening man may go out into the world with a background of solid information which will enable him to make his contrasts with some feeling of surety, and to apply his judgment of the utility of things with the care and sagacity which will reveal the man of understanding. Let us not forget that the term "science" is a broad one, that it is not to be applied merely to physics, mathematics, chemistry, and physiology, but that, in fact, we cannot reflect for long on life itself without calling to our aid the scientific methods of the past.

But the man with the sense of humor cannot repress a smile when he knows that it takes a scientist to upset another scientist. They are always doing that in science. Think for a moment of what has taken place in science since the days of Ptolemy! Copernicus came along and made the Egyptian look rather foolish. Then Newton appeared and gave us more up-to-date ideas of the physical laws of the universe. Then came Einstein and he caused scientists all kinds of nightmares. Now, as Jeans says, scientists had better make no more pronouncements; they had better set to thinking for the next twenty years. So there it is! You never know just when the scientist has discovered something that will confound all the set ideas of his brethren who lived in the generation before him. The strangest part of the matter, however, is that the poor, old discredited past, so full of myth and fantasy, is now becoming the prime attraction of the scientist.

You will not remember what our grandfathers thought about Homer and his works: the Iliad and the Odyssey. Troy to them was a superlative myth, the myth of all myths! There were no such people as Priam, Hector, Agamemnon, Helen, and Cassandra. There was, however, about the middle of the last century, a German boy who heard his father and uncle read the Homeric story of the fall of Troy, and he was audacious enough to believe it. This boy's name was Henry Schliemann, and he made up his mind that he would go to work and make a fortune so that he would have money to search for Troy and discover it. The story of Schliemann should be one of great interest to the student. I believe a biography of him was published a few years ago. The boy Schliemann has himself told us how he studied his languages and became a renowned linguist. He always carried a book with him, and, in every spare moment in the store, he studied and, when sent on an errand, he took from his pocket, his book and read it. Schliemann not only found Troy, but he afterwards crossed over to the mainland, and there he discovered the home of Agamemnon.

How many years is it since anthropologists seemed to have a definite idea that an approximate age could be given to the period of man on earth, and that he was derived from tree-dwelling ancestors? In the middle of the last century, Charles Darwin quite upset many of us by giving us a lineage, or so it was thought he did, that made us feel rather uncomfortable. But now all these ideas are undergoing some extraordinary changes. The Peking man has popped up, and he has shifted the age of man upon this globe back some half million years. Strange to say, this gentleman, out in China, pursued just the same activities, in essentials, that we pursue today. We have found not only some of his food —the bones of animals that he ate; we have also found his tools, and the grains he cultivated. The most amazing part of this story is, we learn that he was a farmer. Rather an old industry—one that goes back 500,000 years! There were cocksure scientists during the nineteenth century who believed implicitly that the original industry was hunting, but the past tells us quite another story. Moreover, this gentleman of Peking has revealed to the anthropologists that he really was a man, and there are no signs at all about his remains that he had any connection whatever with the arboreal species whose tails were as long as their features were unprepossessing.

What a thing is science! But what a wonderful thing is the past, and yet it should not be strange to the thinking man that, if he really wants first-hand information on nearly any cultural subject, he must go to the past to find it. It has been stated by authorities that nothing of importance has been discovered in fundamentals and essentials since the six Greeks from Thales to Democritus.

There was a time when scientists laughed at the notions of alchemists. The transmutation of metals was considered to be a subject for romantic novelists such as Bulwer Lytton. But Lord Rutherford, before he died, did some considerable work in the transmutation of metals, and he never hesitated to tell us that Nature herself is in the business, morning, noon, and night.

It was not difficult in the Middle Ages for the people of a town to learn something of the history of the church from the architecture and iconography. The sculptures, entablatures, and windows taught them the Bible stories. One cannot stand before a great cathedral, such as Chartres, without being impressed with the fact that the church really was "the Bible of the poor." Perhaps that was the reason why so many of the poorest of the boys of that time became great prelates. The spirit of the church, in the best sense of the term, was always there as an inspiration. It was the center of all activity of life in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Now why should not the school stand to the modern boy as the church stood to the boy at the time of St. Thomas Aquinas? The church was the center of learning. Every boy who had a desire to be educated had to go to church and there he learned the history of the institution, what its tradition was, what it meant to mankind and why it should endure.

What boy of today entering a school stops for a moment to think of the tradition of the institution? The school, unfortunately, tells him little or nothing so far as the architecture can speak and, as a rule, schools have no sculptures and no stained-glass windows which record any of the history of the institution. Nevertheless, the boy ought to realize that he is stepping upon sacred ground, for the tradition of the school has been hallowed through the ages and is still to be regarded, in spite of all its defects, in the legitimate line of descent from such great centers of learning as Oxford and Paris.

A Rhodes scholar, some years ago, said that he never realized what a marvelous history was to be found in the development of the college and the university until he read Sir Charles Mallet's *History of Oxford*. Again, if we would know the higher values of those institutions and societies which we use for the purpose of gaining knowledge, we must hark back to the past.

Similar thoughts are inspired when we consider the library, for it is the vessel which contains the history of the culture of man. It is the place where the student will find the best that has been said and thought in the world. Here, again, the pupil is on sacred ground and, if he but know it, he might be the one to be chosen for the writing of a work which does not now exist: that is the history of the library. Think for a moment what such a history would contain, for, long before there were books, men wrote upon stone, impressed characters upon clay, carved hieroglyphics, such as those we see in Egypt, and inscribed their thoughts upon ivory! When you go to Chicago, visit the Oriental Institute and there you will see the beautiful ivories that have been found at Megiddo. There was a day when kings indited a letter upon clay and encased it in a clay envelope. Professor Garstang gave such a missive to Mrs. Neilson. . . .

Many thinkers now wonder why it is that numbers of men whom they meet fall short when it comes to the matter of acquiring some general knowledge of what is going on in the world. It is, of course, a rare thing to meet what we used to call aesthetically, a "good catholic." This meant a person who had what Matthew Arnold used to call culture; that is, to know the best that has been said and thought in the world. But is it a question of time, merely a matter of economizing the hours and planning from day to day what you are to do with your leisure? Every man has hours of leisure, if he knows it. Was it Ruskin who said that he went to bed feeling unhappy if he had not planned a full day to commence with the morn? Who does that now?

This is the age of specialization. Nowadays, every man is born with the idea of getting a job and keeping it, if he can. As the president of a great university points out, a great deal of the system of education is devoted to the notion of fitting young men for industrial or clerical work. It is an entirely new idea and some think a very poor one—one certainly not to be encouraged in a system of education. Education aimed, in the past, at the making of a man. It strove to put the neophyte in the way of acquiring knowledge. Then a transmuting process took place: the knowledge the young person acquired fermented in the mind and spirit, and yielded ideas which inspired the student to pursue the line for which he thought himself best fitted. The question of work, the employment that he undertook was,

in the vast majority of cases, a bread and butter matter which enabled him to keep going while he developed the ideas. After he left school and started as an apprentice in some branch of industrial activity, he had at hand the night school, to which these students thronged fifty years ago, and there, as a rule, he found a laboratory for his ideas where they were developed until he was turned out as an architect, a doctor, a lawyer, an artist, a musician, or whatever the bent was. Education fitted him as a vessel to contain ideas which would enable him to work out his own spiritual salvation. The job business kept body and soul alive while he did the *important* work.

These questions should be asked, in all cases of young men who are half way through their courses in a college or a university: have you no other idea in coming to this institution but one of fitting yourself to undertake a job? Is that all you imagine is to be gained by spending four years in this institution? A year ago a Nobel prize man, and one of the greatest physicists in the world, said that in his laboratory at the university there was a young man who had a genius for using and perfecting electrical apparatus. But he neither knew nor cared to know anything of a cultural worth beyond his specialty. He admitted that he could not enter into general conversation, and for that reason he kept to himself and spent most of his evenings at the movie. He was asked if he did not enjoy reading or if he was musical. He read detective stories sometimes; but as for music, he did not know anything about it.

Is this an unusual case? Some years ago Dr. Huse published *The Illiteracy of the Literate*. As one review said of it, it was one of the saddest commentaries on our system of education that had been published. For our immediate purpose, it is only necessary to quote one short paragraph. Dr. Huse says:

> The only periodicals of large total circulation not immediately dependent upon advertising are the "wood-pulps." Alvin Barklay writes of them as follows:
>
> "A wood-pulp magazine is one of the most diluted forms of pabulum obtainable in America. It is just a half-rung below the average Hollywood movie. For that reason it is, aside from the newspaper, the favorite reading matter of a huge proportion of the reading public."
>
> These magazines, according to Barklay, tell three stories (with variations): Adventure, Mystery, and Love. The love stories are written for women, with the distortion implied. The "westerns" are for big and little boys. (Many of the authors of these have never been west of Pennsylvania.) "The first editor I worked under," writes Barklay, "told me on the first day of my editorial career, 'Always remember that we are getting out a magazine for the Great American Moron.'"

This seems to be hitting below the belt. It is an astonishing statement to come from Barklay who ought to know what he is writing about, but his commentary is not nearly so severe as that which fell from the lips of the head of the University Librarians at their National Convention in New York two years ago. This gentleman stated that they were all proud of their libraries, but they were not proud of the fact that 80 per cent of the students who had access to them left the universities "quite illiterate."

Dissociating ourselves from the type of society which reads the wood-pulp magazine, and turning our attention strictly to those who pass through universities, we might ask how this condition arises. It is now conceded, by educationalists of the thoughtful type, that it is to be attributed to "specialization gone mad," as one put it. This is a very serious charge, and if it be true, it is one which deserves the immediate and close attention of every man who is really interested in education.

Can it be true, as is so often stated, that the young man of today, with all the labor-saving devices which have come to him, cannot find time to apply himself to intellectual avocations? Have the motor car, the radio, and the movie stolen from him the best days of his years, and do these devices yield to him compensations which are of enduring value? To one who lived through the last quarter of the nineteenth century and had to work hard for bread and butter and, at the same time, search within himself for principles which would guide him to days of enjoyment in middle life, it must seem that many of the young people of today have not the intellectual capacity, nor the spiritual strength, to endure privation for the sake of finding cultural abundance. Reviewing the scene as it is presented to us today, we find that it is only the few who are prepared to make sacrifices in the halcyon days, so that they may the better enjoy the years of middle life.

The old viewpoint as to the qualifications and adequacy of youth has changed. It is strange to hear young men and women say they have no time to do this or to do that. This condition is not to be attributed solely to what is called "the pressure of existence." Perhaps the reason for it is that there is not the inclination today to extend the period of acquiring knowledge over a lifetime. Many of these people have spent from eight to twelve years at institutions of learning where they have received not only the elements of knowledge but also the technique of how to acquire more of it. Is it all done then? Is there no more to it than, perhaps, the specialty that is to be the means of earning one's bread and butter? Like the preacher, do they give up the ghost and say, "Much study is a weariness of the flesh"? When one thinks of the labors of love concerning cultural achievement in which men persisted until late in long lives, when there were no such labor-saving devices as we know, either in mechanics or in education, it does seem extraordinary that the desire for learning for its own sake should almost disappear.

Well, what we need is the desire for culture—the craving to know the best that has been thought and said in the world! When this comes to the reflective being and he ponders the great question of who he is, and from whence he sprang, there seems to come into his mind the necessity of making links with the past. How did he arrive? By what means has he attained his stature? What has gone on in the long periods of the past to make him an individual? Why this—and what else?—the thirst for knowledge. And when he places himself in the tradition of those who gave to us our soundest views of economics, philosophy, art, and poetry, he knows that he is one of the army of the battalions who fought with their intellects to make the world beautiful and to inspire high ideals in their progeny. And that is why the past is so valuable to us. It tells us of that fight; it shows us the great ascending scale by which men have evolved from civilization to civilization, until today they realize that they

are the heirs of the paeans of the great.

The Greek idea of perfectionism was undoubtedly the highest plane of culture and refinement to which man ever aspired. "Make your life perfect" is the echo of the Man from Nazareth. He, undoubtedly, was inspired by the Greek ideal. Perfectionism was not only an intellectual achievement; it was physical also. A sound mind in a sound body. To give the care to the body that one gave to the mind was not, however, the whole gospel of the Greek. He realized, as we know from Plato and Socrates, that perfectionism of the spirit was an essential of the whole man. And the Greek appreciated the refining influence of ideas. He realized how the intellect seemed always, when it was exercised, in a process of purging away the dross. The higher the intellect, the clearer the vision. The apex of the philosophy was to realize the divine in man, for that was the necessary ultimate for bringing about the Utopian ruler, the philosopher-king.

How far short we have fallen of these ideals, only men who have studied the past can tell. Yet so long as there is youth, there is hope, and it needs only a great rivival, such as we have had in times past, to thrill our youth and set him on edge to crave something better than he gets today. But first he must realize that the condition is what he makes it; if he wants change, he must change himself. He must desire the precious things of life—the indispensable tradition which will make him realize his full worth!

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention—*Editor.*]

The British government has established a commission to deal with conscientious objectors, of whom 3,700 have to date appeared. Objectors are respectfully heard, and in the majority of cases are offered alternative service. If this service is refused, the objectors are imprisoned. Communists, we understand, are given short shrift.

Miss Sarah Cleghorn, distinguished poet and social worker, an ardent pacifist in the last war, published in the September 14th issue of the New York *Herald-Tribune* the following letter:

> May I sound an older woman's warning, as the drums of propaganda begin to be heard, drawing us again (and so soon!) into the crude sentimentalisms of war, in which bombing mothers and babies appears chivalrous, and we thank God that we are not as Hitler is?
>
> There are things to remember, which have been said and done in literature and history, which speak with a still, small but everlasting voice.
>
> The followers of Jesus who knew him personally were pacifists.
>
> He blessed them in the Beatitudes, for pacifist is only Latin for peacemaker.
>
> He prophesied that those who took the sword would perish by the sword.
>
> His own country was under the heel of the Romans, and he refused to head any army to free it.
>
> He advised the following treatment for enemies: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink" —in modern terms, an economic conference for satisfying the needs of all peoples.
>
> Edith Cavell, in her illuminated hour of death, said: "A life is a life to me, be it Teuton or Saxon."
>
> Edna Millay, in one of her two greatest poems, says: "I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for death. . . . Though he flick me with his whip, I will not tell him which way the fox ran. With his hoof on my breast, I will not tell him where the black boy hides in the jungle. I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for death; I am not on his pay roll."
>
> Let us forget this passing hate and absurd self-righteousness, and remember the everlasting humility and love which alone are true.

The New York *Times,* on September 15th last, published the following dispatch from Pawtucket, Rhode Island:

> The Reverend John Wilson Haynes, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, this city, has declared flatly: "I will never bestow the blessing of the church on any soldier recruited from this parish for service on the Continent."
>
> "We must keep ourselves constantly awake to the supreme Christian principle of love for all men, both victor and victim," he said.

The shooting of conscientious objectors has begun in Germany, as see the following Associated Press dispatch:

> Berlin, Sept. 16.—Execution of Germany's first conscientious objector was reported today by authorities.
>
> August Dickman of Dinslaken was shot by a firing squad on charges of refusing to go to the front.

A United Press dispatch described Dickman as "a fanatical member of an international sect of Bible students," which is assumed to mean Judge Joseph Rutherford's International Bible Students Association, which furnished many conscientious objectors in the last war.

Richard B. Gregg, author of that well-known book *The Power of Non-Violence,* has recently published a pamphlet entitled, *Pacifist Program in Time of War, Threatened War, or Fascism.* Watch for a review of this pamphlet in our book column. Copies at 10 cents each may be obtained of Directors, Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pennsylvania.

On Sunday, September 24th, preaching at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, the Reverend Walter P. Kellenberg said, "We must pray for peace at any cost."

He Who Laughs Last

They hung him on a gallows high,
Upon a hill where all could see.
They laughed and mocked: "A madman, he!
A fool, so let him die."

But now has come another day,
By them unsought, to them unknown.
The intervening years have shown
He was not mad, but they.

The world goes reeling to the deeps
Because his word it will not hear,
But now it comes his turn to jeer
He does not laugh, he weeps.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

The Church and World Peace

PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN*

The question of the church and world peace involves consideration of the responsibilities of the one ageless institution with an eternal message of goodness, beauty, and truth toward the problems of war and peace. These are responsibilities which cannot be determined by a perusal of the latest newspaper headlines. They are responsibilities which must be determined in light of the age-old experience and message of the church.

I would like to begin by emphasizing the stake of the church in world peace. Think of the position of the Judeo-Christian religion before the war, strong institutionally and powerful morally in all of the lands of the western world. And then see how out of the chaos and the bloodshed and the cynicism let loose as a flood by the war, the church received the worst setbacks in its history. I cannot recall in all the history of the human race up to 1917 any instance in which a government deprived an entire nation of its faith. There was no such instance until the war produced so vast an upheaval in Russia that a handful of Communists were able to seize power and within one generation to drive religion from the hearts of one hundred and sixty million people. And now the tremendous influence of Communistic atheism is felt in every land on earth.

Recently Father Walsh of the Catholic University stated that the Brown Bolshevism of Nazi Germany represented a more serious threat to the church than the Red Bolshevism of Soviet Russia. I believe that he is right. In Communist Russia the aims of the enemy are perfectly clear, and organized religion can mobilize all of its forces to fight them. In the Nazi fascist program, however, there is involved a process of demoralization, disintegration, and prostitution of the churches which reduces them to impotence without a fight. Furthermore, it is entirely conceivable that the church should function happily and effectively in a Socialist society (the union of Communism with atheism was the product largely of the reactionary and corrupt character of the Russian State Church) but it can never be happy or effective in a social order which insists that the state is God and that a Führer is its prophet.

And that precisely is its position in ever-increasing areas of the earth's surface. The most powerful nation on the European continent has established a pagan state religion and has reduced the church to a position of subserviency. As its power and influence increase, its ideas will spread over the entire western world, leaving religion nowhere safe from their threat.

Not only in these open and successful attacks in certain countries has organized religion suffered as a consequence of the war, but also and everywhere has the church been the victim of a widespread cynicism and skepticism caused by the part it played in that war. I take the liberty of going back to my own experience. I can never forget how religious forces led me to believe when I enlisted for service in the summer of 1918 that I was embarking upon a holy crusade. I was given the feeling that my act was not only righteous but sanctified.

Then I recall our first bayonet instruction on the drill field at Plattsburg barracks, how the instructor, a British officer, whipped us up into a fury against the straw dummies which he was teaching us to attack as Huns. He told us of the vulnerable parts of the human body where a thrust would mean a sure kill. A short time afterward I talked with a man recently returned from fighting at the front. He told me how one day he had met in hand-to-hand combat a young German soldier. He was a boy, probably no more than sixteen, and because my friend was older, stronger, and more experienced, he quickly succeeded in running his bayonet through the lad's heart; and then, as he saw his fresh, warm blood spill on the ground, as he watched his face become distorted with the coming agonies of death, he said he knew that what he had done was evil, that nothing which might come from the war could ever justify the act of murder he had committed upon a young boy with whom he had no quarrel.

I asked myself then what is holy about this, how can a church, professing the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, bless such wholesale murder. I did not know then how wrong in judgment the churches had been, nor what a travesty would come of their hopes for a world safe for democracy and free from militarism and war. I did not know then how completely they had accepted the lies manufactured by the propaganda machines, how naively they had ignored the sordid realities which had caused the conflict. Perhaps if I had known, it might not have proved especially disturbing, for they shared these tragic blunders of judgment with all other institutions. What so completely revolted me was their moral blunder, was the blessing they pronounced on the greatest crime in history, was the way the churches on both sides sent men to kill one another in the name of the same God. And then, I, who had been planning to enter the ministry, determined that I would never set foot in a church again, that I would find some more decent and more honest institution through which to express my idealism. If some years later I did enter the ministry, it was not because of my personal experience with the churches but because of their history, because of what I felt they might be. But my point is that the kind of cynical agnosticism which the war generated in me was spread across the earth. The best young people became disgusted with the churches and turned to social movements for the expression of their idealism and their faith. From these losses the church will not recover in our generation, perhaps never. It is not entirely personal bias which causes Charles Beard so to minimize the significance of religion in *America in Midpassage* that he ignores it completely. I am afraid that Will Durant was quite right in stating in the leading article of the *Saturday Evening Post* (August 5, 1939): "The First World War did more harm to Christianity than all the Voltaires in history."

I am also afraid that Mr. Durant is equally right in predicting that, "the Second World War may complete its destruction." As the western world goes up again in flame, who knows what will be left when the smoke clears? In the light of all that has happened since 1914, what hope is there that democracy and human dignity can survive such a catastrophe? Bloodshed, revolution, tyranny may become the accepted way of life for all the children of men. In terms of self-interest alone, the churches have the best reason for mobilizing all of their forces against the wickedness of war.

*Rabbi of Temple Brith-Kodesh, Rochester, N. Y.—*Editor.*

Let me speak plainly! When I speak of the churches mobilizing their forces against the wickedness of war, I do not refer to pious platitudes about peace, quickly forgotten when the threat of war comes. I do not refer to a program of expediency which generally proves to be a form of subserviency to the state. I speak rather of a clean and complete severance of religion from the institution of war. I realize that this may seem to be impracticable and possibly unpatriotic. I realize that churches have vested interests, moral as well as economic. I realize that their leaders would in many countries suffer terribly if such a program were adopted. But I contend that such losses suffered by the churches and their leaders would be as nothing compared with the losses the churches will suffer if they give their blessings to another war.

I realize, of course, that religious pacifism does not solve the war problem, that it may even balance the scales toward the side of iniquity in a particular crisis, although I hasten to add that the guilt is not always as clear to religious leaders as might be expected. If Nazi Germany has been so clearly immoral in its international policy in recent years, why have the German churches not condemned it; and if fascist Italy has been so clearly immoral, why have the Italian churches not condemned it? And in this present war, are we not confronted again by the spectacle of churches of the same faith on both sides blessing their citizens as they go forth to kill one another in the name of the same God?

On the basis of a justifiable self-interest, I find that the duty of the churches to world peace is to renounce war. Let them be the rallying places for the peace-lovers of the world. The issue will be clear. Men will know if they join the churches, as they know when they join the Society of Friends, that they have joined an institution which will not permit them to kill other human beings, but only to heal and to help. I think this is the only way the church can save itself in the critical years that lie ahead.

In this present European war, I conceive it the duty of the American churches to use all their strength to the end that this country will not be involved. My conviction is that this war will solve no problems but only create new ones; that it will make a shambles of European civilization, and establish a new and worse social order in most of the nations of Europe. The churches will be swallowed up in the new dark ages. I would like to save America from that tragic fate. I would like to preserve here an island of sanity in a mad world. I would like there to be one place in this world where democracy still functions, where men live and work together in decent, friendly association, where churches still are free to preach the gospel and are not adjuncts of the military machine. As a churchman, if for no other reason, I would like to keep America out of war.

I would like to point out, however, that for the churches enlightened self-interest is consistent with the eternal verities which they preach. I do not know whether in ages long past war could be reconciled with religion, but I am profoundly convinced that today, when war means the destruction not only of millions of men but of vast numbers of equally innocent women and children, when it means the raining down of murderous bombs on great cities, the snuffing out of life by poisoned gases, the annihilation of populations by deliberately induced diseases, yes, I am profoundly convinced that today war cannot be reconciled with the teaching of my faith, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," or the teaching of him who said, "By this shall men know ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another."

If you ask me, then, what I regard as the duty of the churches to world peace, I answer that it is to state publicly, clearly, courageously, that they will have no more traffic with war. I am far from certain that this is an impractical program. It is interesting to speculate on what would happen if the supreme head of the Catholic Church would announce at this time that the church would not bestow its blessing upon those of its members who go to war. I wonder what would happen if the Lutheran and the Baptist churches in Germany, as well as the Protestant and Catholic and Jewish leaders in other lands, would announce publicly that they regard war as a sin and would not give their blessing to those who participate in it. The time has come for a holy crusade against war. It would be costly in sacrifice and suffering for the religious communions. Perhaps some of them might even be compelled to return to the catacombs to survive. But that would be a surer and a fitter way of surviving than in subserviency to the militarism of the modern state. In my opinion, that is the only way by which the message and ultimately the institutions of religion will be saved. And if we do not follow this way, then our failure is clearly on our own heads. Facing God, dare we do less?

Christian Direct Action

FRED W. SHORTER

Ray Becker, the last of the I. W. W. prisoners who were sent to the Washington State penitentiary almost twenty years ago, was set free by commutation of sentence last week. That simple announcement was made in the newspapers. It will be of interest to readers of UNITY to know how our conservative governor happened to free Becker. The story is one of Christian direct action.

The term "direct action" has a sinister meaning. One thinks of dynamite or at best protest parades. We mean by direct action the kind of action that Christians have advocated throughout the centuries, but which is little used. It is to go directly and talk face to face with the man who has the power to accomplish what is desired. An example is that of George Lansbury going to Hitler, of Gandhi talking face to face with the viceroy of India.

In the Ray Becker case, the direct action crossed the continent. A Christian man of some means in New York City read of Ray Becker's refusal to take a parole because in doing so he felt that he would be admitting guilt. This man admired Becker's courage and tenacity. He wrote to him, not once but time and again. He built up a real friendship with him. It was my privilege to meet Ray at the prison "gates," actually in the warden's office. And almost the first thing he said was that he would have to wire his "friend" in New York and tell him to open the champagne. In the few

hours that we were with him he talked almost constantly of his friend. One could see that there had been established, not a noblesse oblige relationship, but a real friendship. This was the first step in direct action.

Living in New York is another man, a great champion of human justice, Roger Baldwin of the Civil Liberties Union. The two men got together. Mr. Baldwin finally saw a way by which Becker could be freed and at the same time not be humiliated. In 1937 Washington enacted a law by which it is possible to commute the sentence of a prisoner to the time served. That automatically restores him to full citizenship. Mr. Baldwin then wrote State Senator Mary U. Farquharson of Seattle and asked her to see the governor. She responded enthusiastically because she, too, had had this injustice on her heart for a long time. It was not so simple as it sounds. The governor is very conservative. He remembers the intense feeling, amounting to hatred, that swept the state and still hangs on. He was afraid that, if released, Becker might agitate and open up those old sores.

When Mrs. Farquharson suggested a commutation, the governor expressed all these fears and more. But he was enough impressed to visit Becker personally and ask, of all things, whether he would agitate if he were released! Becker naturally gave him no satisfaction. And there the thing hung for a long time. Mrs. Farquharson saw the governor time and again. Fortunately, we have as chairman of the parole board a young man who at least has some sympathy for prisoners. He suggested that if there could be some assurance that Becker would leave the state, there would be a good chance of the governor's liberating him. At this point in the negotiations the friend from New York said: "I will guarantee him a job." The parole board chairman then asked if someone would meet Becker at the gates. Mrs. Farquharson suggested the writer and that is how it happened that we were privileged to share that supreme moment in Becker's life.

It vividly recalled to my mind a Sunday morning eleven years ago. I had just preached a sermon on Christian justice. After the service an insignificant looking man came up to me and said: "Do you believe what you said this morning?" That was direct action! Nonplussed for a moment I replied, "Of course I do." He then said that he would call my attention to an act of injustice. The following day he sent me a record of the Centralia trial of the I. W. W.'s. As I read it my blood boiled over at the injustice of it all. Lest I cool down, I was the recipient of more direct action. The wife and child of one of the prisoners were introduced to me. She asked tearfully for help from a Christian minister. The challenge could not be avoided. The effect of accepting it was a struggle between minister and a smug church that lasted for five years until the minister was dismissed from the pulpit.

Back from seeing Ray Becker freed and in the hands of loving friends, we could not help thinking: "Direct action is the thing." To talk about the hypocrisy of ministers and politicians is not enough; one must challenge them directly, face to face. The results are often amazing.

The Study Table

Worshipful Public Service

THE ART OF CONDUCTING PUBLIC WORSHIP. *By Albert W. Palmer.* 211 *pp. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $2.50.

President Palmer has on other occasions made us all his debtor. But his newest book, *The Art of Conducting Public Worship,* increases this debt immeasurably. How any pastor or Seminary student can survive without reading and practising the words of this wise book surpasses the present reviewer. Here in about two hundred pages is the cream of pastoral theology put in a succinct form that all can read, enjoy, and thereby increase the effectiveness of the Christian Church. All agree that worship must be restored to much institutional religion, but all ask, "How is it to be done?" Here is the most intelligent and the most reverent reply that has appeared from the press in these latter years. Just now when the world is again upset by the second installment of the World War, when nerves are jangled, and people again wonder what to believe and why they should go to church, this book should be made not only available to all but, if possible, required reading. Every problem facing the church finds here a sensible recognition: the difficulties of worshipful services in unworshipful environments, the planning of a worship service, the problem of saving the non-liturgical service from becoming just a lecture preceded by preliminary exercises. Every part of the successful church service, the sermon, prayers, Bible reading, the choir, congregational singing are here coördinated and given the measure of importance which is their due—one of the high points in the book is the discussion of church architecture, lighting, and sanctuary beauty. This book is the answer to a long-felt need. Some philanthropically minded layman ought to buy up the entire edition and present it to the ministry of America.

* * *

THE FINE ART OF PUBLIC WORSHIP. *By Andrew W. Blackwood. Nashville: Cokesbury Press.* $2.00.

Professor Blackwood of the Department of Homiletics at Princeton Theological Seminary has made a definite contribution to the rapidly growing body of literature dealing with public worship in the Protestant churches. Professor Blackwood's contribution lies in the fact that he approaches the subject from the point of view of an historian. This is the way to go about this subject. The Christian Church is the child of the Jewish Church. What was the nature and purpose of the Jewish Church? Wherein did the early Christians improve upon the worship of the Synagogue? The place to begin, the first source, for public worship is the Bible. Professor Blackwood rightly begins here. But he soon goes on to the very practical application of his theme to the needs of the modern parish of today. In developing his theme, the author gently but authoritatively puts his finger on the weakest spots in the average worship service of the average church. Then, like a good physician, he applies the needed remedy. This is a good book. Buy it and give it to your pastor.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Kinship

Men,
like stars,
find glory
in sharing their
light.

LLOYD FRANK MERRELL

Correspondence

Propaganda of Omission

Editor of UNITY:

The public is emphatically urged to beware of the propaganda in the press and radio news coming from the warring nations. No easy job for us readers and listeners, but it can be done—at least to some extent—where we meet propaganda *in commission.* But how can we detect and protect ourselves against propaganda of *omission?*

During the fatal days we read and listened day and night but heard not a single mention of any speeches in opposition to Great Britain's declaration of war and the proposal of constructive, non-violent alternatives, although such speeches had been made in the House of Commons by George Lansbury and Mr. Maxton, and in the House of Lords by Lord Arnold and Lord Ponsonby.

Nor has any correspondent or radio commentator in his descriptions of the "atmosphere" in London and the rest of the country, and the temper of the English people mentioned the innumerable peace meetings held all over England.

How—in view of all this—is the mass of newspaper readers and radio listeners to protect itself against the propaganda of omission designed to give the outside world an impression of unity and uniformity of thought in accepting war as the only solution to complex world problems?

EDITH WYNNER

New York, N. Y.

Can We Be Christians?

Editor of UNITY:

Where are the Christians today who believe in turning the other cheek? If Poland had done that there would have been no war. Christian Poland believes in fighting for its rights in preference to being Christian.

According to Christ we should submit to the inevitable. We should be noncombatants, war-resisters and peacemakers. If one does us a wrong, we should not retaliate, but try to do him good.

"Might is right" is not alone with Hitler. If war is evil, how can we overcome evil with evil? "Overcome evil with good," is Christian. But how are we to overcome evil with good? How can we do good to them that hate us? It looks as if we should not try to follow the teachings of Christ. If war is sometimes justifiable, which we believe it is, how can any of us claim to be Christian?

If Great Britain and France had said to Hitler:

> Hitler, we don't believe in your teaching, you are decidedly wrong, we advise you to change your ways. Come out on the side of Christianity. Don't fight; that is wrong. Seek peace! But if you insist on fighting Poland, go ahead! It is your funeral, not ours. We won't fight, no matter what you do. We are Christian people. We are extremely sorry for you, and would like to stop you from doing wrong, but we can't because we are Christians.

We preach Christ; we believe in non-resistance—if England and France had thus spoken, had both agreed not to fight, I wonder what would have happened to them? Perhaps Hitler would have professed to love them, and blessed them for giving him a chance to overcome the Polish nation by force?

If the teachings of Christ are not followed, how can we claim to be Christian? And we cannot follow them and overcome our enemies. The only way to overcome them appears to be by force, so it looks as if we need a new religion today: a religion of righteousness. That is, doing that which appears right to us, and it looks as if it is right to try and help the underdog. But we cannot help by preaching, only by doing.

Great Britain has tried the Christian way to show Hitler the error of his ways, but he won't give in. He still insists that might is right; therefore, Great Britain and France must fight him along his own lines. What else can they do?

Jesus of Nazareth is said to be the founder of Christianity. He tried to teach a new doctrine: the doctrine of love. Didn't he chide Peter for lopping off the ear of the high priest's servant? Yet, no doubt, poor Peter thought he was doing right for fighting for the cause of Christ.

And was it not this same Jesus who said: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto thee, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which persecute you."

If that idea had been carried out, there would have been no war. But how are soldiers to fight to kill the soldiers of enemy nations if they do not hate them? What have they guns and bayonets for if not for the purpose of killing? The idea of warfare is to kill the people of enemy nations; kill them in any way—by sword, with the bayonet, with bombs, or with poison gas. The idea of war is to kill. Both sides are out to kill; even though both sides claim to be Christian.

How long will it be before swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, and the spears into pruning hooks; when nation shall not lift up the sword against nation, and they shall learn war no more?

It is a long time ago since Isaiah predicted that. And it seems as far away as ever, if not farther. No wonder so many people have lost confidence in the Bible.

Two Christian nations at war are like two men who have determined to commit suicide; each gets the other to kill him, or try to, because it is a sin for one to take his own life. One accommodates the other by committing murder.

JOHN A. ROWLAND

Stratford, Ont., Canada

Questions Democracy of Empires

Editor of UNITY:

I read Henry W. Pinkham's "'Union Now'—of How Many?", but did not see Miss Tracy D. Mygatt's article. But in a discussion I heard over the radio a while ago in which Clarence K. Streit took part, Miss Mygatt, as I recall, was the one who brought out the fact that the proposed union was not merely of fifteen nations—each self-governing in what is termed the democratic form—but that it was a union of empires in which the majority of the people would be subjects—that if the peoples of India and Africa, etc., who would be included were given representation by population on a par with the whites of the fifteen nations, the latter would be outvoted, but that the peoples of India and Africa, etc.—the present subject peoples—were to remain subject and not elect representatives to the parliament. Great Britain, France, Holland and the United States of America are all empires—all hold subject peoples; that is not democracy.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW

Del Rosa, California

Does Not Like the Church!

Editor of UNITY:

Because of more deserving claims, the time to pursue the editorials in the July 17th issue of UNITY was deferred and though belated there is a desire to register my reaction.

Your editorial columns contain the interrogative caption—"Has Religion Quite Disappeared?", referring to the failure of the Beards to mention religion in their recent history, *America in Midpassage.* Such a question is tantamount to asking if God is dead. The religion of God as exemplified by Jesus fails to function, that is evident. The religion annunciated by that Jewel-of-Judaea was and is all powerful, is always at hand. Few choose to express it, as required, hence the results!

Obviously Professor and Mrs. Charles Beard observed this fact. Has the editor shut his eyes? Is it expedient to deal in misnomers? Says James Russell Lowell: "Let us speak plain; there is more force in names than most men dream of; and a lie may keep its throne a whole age longer if it skulk behind the shield of some fair-seeming name. Let us call tyrants tyrants. . . . For men in earnest have not time to waste in patching fig-leaves on the naked truth." The Beards are cognizant of the Pope's disposition and would anticipate his blessing on General Franco. Likewise they expect the inconsistent words and deeds of other organizations misnamed religion. They evidently received counsel from Lowell in these words—"The traitor to humanity is the traitor most accurst; better rot beneath the sod, than be true to church and state while we are doubly false to God." The churches with their pseudo-theology and diluted religion have not used the truth barriers which God substantiates and Christ proclaimed.

We must desist this blinking which inhibits seeing the culpable status of the present religious organizations. The church will need no defense when it practices the religion of Jesus. It requires censure until it does. Therefore, the deliberate reticence of the Beards is a dynamic voice, a cogent admonition.

GEORGE W. TUCKER

Exeter, California